



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/705,181	11/10/2003	Ian D. Hegerty	5598/154US	4662

7590 10/26/2006

Seth Ostrow  
Brown Raysman Millstein Felder and Steiner LLP  
900 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-4728

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 10/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/705,181

Applicant(s)

HEGERTY ET AL.

Examiner

Ranodhi Serrao

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11 September 2006 has been entered.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
3. The applicant argued that the prior art references fail to teach the invention as claimed. However, the newly cited reference(s) teach these features. See below rejections.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
5. Claims 2-4, 20-21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. (2005/0114484) and Zha et al. (7,028,027).

Art Unit: 2141

6. As per claim 24, Wilson et al. teaches a method of determining a countrytag for a website on a network (see Wilson et al., page 7, claim 1), comprising: identifying a set of country hosts for a plurality of websites, each country host having a country-related domain (see Wilson et al., ¶ 65-70); assigning a countrytag to each country host that corresponds to the country-related domain for the respective country host (see Wilson et al., ¶ 60-64); identifying a set of global hosts for a plurality of websites, each global host not having a country-related domain (see Wilson et al., ¶ 11). But fails to teach analyzing one or more inlinks to at least one global host from the set of global host to determine a countrytag for the at least one global host; and producing an augmented set of hosts that includes the set of country hosts, the at least one global host, and the corresponding countrytags for each country host and the at least one global host. However, Zha et al. teaches analyzing one or more inlinks to at least one global host from the set of global host to determine a countrytag for the at least one global host (see Zha et al., col. 10, lines 8-29); and producing an augmented set of hosts that includes the set of country hosts, the at least one global host, and the corresponding countrytags for each country host and the at least one global host (see Zha et al., col. 10, lines 30-47). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. to analyzing one or more inlinks to at least one global host from the set of global host to determine a countrytag for the at least one global host; and producing an augmented set of hosts that includes the set of country hosts, the at least one global host, and the corresponding countrytags for each country host and the at least one global host in order to compensate for regional differences by

Art Unit: 2141

associating documents with classification values and ranking documents based on classification weights (see Zha et al., col. 1, line 52-col. 2, line 10).

7. As per claim 2, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach a method, wherein the country-related domain is a top-level domain (see Wilson et al., ¶ 24).

8. As per claim 3, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach a method, further comprising: crawling the network to gather information about the pages or sites in the network, including the top-level domain and connectivity of the crawled sites (see Wilson et al., ¶ 39; wherein searching serves the function of crawling).

9. As per claim 4, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach a method, wherein the network is the Internet (see Wilson et al., ¶ 27).

10. As per claim 20, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach a method, wherein a different test is used to determine if a website should be assigned a "US" countrytag than is used for assigning countrytags of non-US countries (see Wilson et al., ¶ 9).

11. As per claim 21, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach a method, wherein a website can be assigned more than one countrytag (see Wilson et al., ¶ 82).

12. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. and Zha et al. as applied to claim 24 above, and further in view of Schuetze et al. (6,941,321).

13. As per claim 5, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above, but fail to teach a method, wherein the network is an intranet. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the network is an intranet (see Schuetze et

Art Unit: 2141

al., col. 10, lines 9-18). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method, wherein the network is an intranet to serve a company's internal purposes (see Schuetze et al., col. 1, lines 35-40).

14. As per claim 6, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above, and furthermore Wilson et al. teaches a method wherein said analyzing comprises at least on country host from the set of country hosts (see Wilson et al., ¶ 60-70). But fails to teach analyzing one or more inlinks. However, Schuetze et al. teaches analyzing one or more inlinks (see Schuetze et al., col. 2, lines 43-56). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zha et al. and Wilson et al. to analyzing one or more inlinks in order to advantageously employ a framework to enhance browsing, searching, retrieving and recommending content in a collection of documents (see Schuetze et al., col. 5, lines 43-47).

15. Claims 7, 9, 11, and 16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al. and Zha et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Pitkow et al. (2002/0016786).

16. As per claim 7, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above but fail to teach a method of analyzing inlinks to and outlinks from the at least one global host. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method of analyzing inlinks to and outlinks from the at least one global host (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 20). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify

Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method of analyzing inlinks to and outlinks from the at least one global host in order to build up a relevance profile for each individual and/or group and map that profile in accordance with a determined relevance model to collection content (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 120).

17. As per claim 9, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 8 above but fail to teach a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 118). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method, wherein the predetermined number is 10 in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 119).

18. As per claim 11, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method of wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether a root or default document page for the at least one global host exists in one and only one ODP country section. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method of wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether a root or default document page for the at least one global host exists in one and only one ODP country section. (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 118). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method of wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether a root or default document page for the at least one global host exists in one and only one ODP country

Art Unit: 2141

section in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 119).

19. As per claim 16, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set. However, Pitkow et al. teaches a method, further comprising: summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 103). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method, further comprising: summing unique inlinking hosts and outlinking hosts in the augmented set in order to provide a user with a "substitute" bookmark when a preferred document is unavailable (see Pitkow et al., ¶ 102).

20. Claims 10, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Zha et al., Schuetze et al., and Pitkow et al.

21. As per claim 10, Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 8 above but Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. fail to teach a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60%. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60% (see Schuetze et al., col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. to a method, wherein the predetermined percentage is 60% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population,



Art Unit: 2141

quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Schuetze et al., abstract).

22. As per claim 14, Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 13 above but Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. fail to teach a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40%. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40% (see Schuetze et al., col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. to a method, wherein the first predetermined percentage is 40% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Schuetze et al., abstract).

23. As per claim 15, Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 13 above but Wilson et al. and Pitkow et al. fail to teach a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32%. However, Schuetze et al. teaches a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32% (see Schuetze et al., col. 29, line 54-col. 30, line 7: wherein it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to change the predetermined percentage). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the

Art Unit: 2141

time of the invention to modify Wilson et al., Zha et al. and Pitkow et al. to a method, wherein the second predetermined percentage is 32% in order for quantitatively representing users in a user population, quantitatively determining similarity between users, clustering users according to those similarities, and visually representing clusters of users by analogy to clusters of documents (see Schuetze et al., abstract).

24. Claims 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. as applied to claims 1 and 7 above, and further in view of Lakritz (6,526,426).

25. As per claim 12, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether the at least one global host is marked for manual countrytagging. However, Lakritz teaches a method wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether the at least one global host is marked for manual countrytagging (see Lakritz, col. 4, lines 27-38). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method wherein said analyzing comprises determining whether the at least one global host is marked for manual countrytagging in order to allow the most appropriate language of a requested document to be served to a Web browser (see Lakritz, col. 15, lines 59-61).

26. As per claim 19, Wilson et al. and Zha et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claim 24 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: determining a countrytag for a web subsite. However, Lakritz teaches a method, further comprising determining a

Art Unit: 2141

countrytag for a web subsite (see Lakritz, col. 6, lines 28-42). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al. and Zha et al. to a method, further comprising determining a countrytag for a web subsite in order to allow a multilingual web site to be built incrementally (see Lakritz, col. 6, lines 14-18).

27. Claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zha et al. and Pitkow et al. (7,031,961)

28. As per claim 22, Zha et al. teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country, comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following are true (see Zha et al., col. 3, lines 5-21): there are more unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains than from global domains (see Zha et al., col. 9, lines 38-44), there are more than a predetermined number of unique inlinking hosts from country code top-level domains (see Zha et al., col. 9, lines 45-57), and there are more than a predetermined diversity of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain (see Zha et al., col. 9, line 58-col. 10, line 7). But fails to teach a percentage. However, Pitkow et al. teaches popularity percentage (see Pitkow et al., col. 7, lines 20-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zha et al. to teach percentages in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pitkow et al., col. 20, lines 4-19).

Art Unit: 2141

29. As per claim 23, Zha et al. teaches a method of determining whether a web site is of interest to users in a particular country, comprising: assigning a countrytag to a global host of the web site when all of the following three tests are true (see Zha et al., col. 3, lines 5-21): there are more than a first predetermined diversity of unique inlinking hosts from a same country code top-level domain (see Zha et al., col. 9, lines 38-44), a particular country code top-level domain accounts for more than a second predetermined diversity of non-global unique inlinking hosts (see Zha et al., col. 9, lines 45-57), and the number of inlinking hosts from a particular country is more than a predetermined threshold value (see Zha et al., col. 9, line 58-col. 10, line 7). But fails to teach a percentage. However, Pitkow et al. teaches popularity percentage (see Pitkow et al., col. 7, lines 20-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Zha et al. to teach percentages in order to provide more directly relevant search results to that particular user (see Pitkow et al., col. 20, lines 4-19).

30. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. as applied to claims 24 and 7 above, and further in view of Page (6,285,999).

31. As per claim 17, Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding

Art Unit: 2141

extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country (see Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when a name of a non-global host suggests that country in order to provide a document ranking method that is scalable and can be applied to extremely large databases such as the world wide web (see Page, col. 2, lines 39-50).


32. As per claim 18, Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. teach the mentioned limitations of claims 24 and 7 above but fail to teach a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country. However, Page teaches a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country (see Page, col. 9, lines 15-22). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wilson et al., Zha et al., and Pitkow et al. to a method, further comprising: adding extra points to a voting value for a country when an IP address of the host is in that country in order to provide a document ranking method that is scalable and can be applied to extremely large databases such as the world wide web (see Page, col. 2, lines 39-50).

33. Claims 8 and 13 have similar limitations as to claims 2-24 above; therefore, they are being rejected under the same rationale.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

  
RUPAL DHARIA  
SENIOR PATENT EXAMINER